

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	Ο.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/643,647		08/22/2000	Richard W. Dimeo	1-19-4-9	2426	
32361	75	590 09/24/2004		EXAMINER		
		G TRAURIG, LLP	PEREZ GUTIERREZ, RAFAEL			
885 3RD . NEW YO		NUE NY 10022		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,			2686		
				DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/643,647	Dimeo et al.					
,	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Rafael Perez-Gutierrez	2686					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	-				
THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply to a	n				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the contraction.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See M R 1.136(a) and the appropriate	MPEP				
fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	the shortened statutory period for reply on the later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b).	originally set in the final Office ing date of the final rejection, or	action: or				
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	riod set forth in f the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	••						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplify	ing the				
(d) $oxed{oxed}$ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		•					
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT plac	ce the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were new	rly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered and a w or appended.	n				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	·						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: 3,10,11,13 and 17.							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4,5,7-9,12,14-16 and 18-20</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	- <u></u> -					
10. Other:	•						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Vogt et al. still meet the claimed invention in claims 1, 8, and 15. Applicant basically argues that Vogt et al. utilizes a single signal path as opposed to two distinct paths. The Examiner respectfully disagrees because Vogt et al. clearly show two separate and distinct paths for the incoming signal. One path going to S1 and another path going to LPF 11. Furthermore, the amplitude of the signal in said another path is used to control the filters 14 (see column 2 line 49 - column 3 line 22). Finally, the current claim language is broad enough that even if Vogt et al. use upstream and dowstream measurements, as argued by the Applicant, they still meet the claimed invention as explained above. Consequently, the final rejection is maintained by the Examiner.

PATENT EXAMINER

9/20/04